











Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of a virtual Community of Practice in the empowerment of patients with ischemic heart disease: An ongoing randomized controlled trial (e-MPODERA2 project)

Vall-Roqué H^{1,2,3,4}, Koatz D^{1,2,3,4}, Cifuentes P⁵, Ramos-García V^{3,6}, Torres A^{3,6}, Rivero A^{3,6}, García J, Pacheco V¹, Perestelo-Pérez L^{3,4,7}, Orrego C^{1,2,3,4}, González-González Al ^{5,8} Avedis Donabedian Research Institute (FAD), Spain; ² Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain; ³ Network for Research on Chronicity, Primary Care, and Health Promotion (RICAPPS), Spain; ⁴ Health Services Research Network on Chronic Diseases (REDISSEC), Spain; ⁵ Gerencia Asistencial de Atención Primaria, Servicio Madrileño de Salud. Madrid. Spain; ⁶ Fundación Canaria Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Canarias (FIISC). Tenerife. Spain; 7 Evaluation Unit of the Canary Islands Health Service (SESCS). Tenerife. Spain; 8 Institute für Allgemein Medicine, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universät, Frankfurt 🖂 aisabel.gonzalezg@salud.madrid.org

BACKGROUND

Virtual Communities of Practice (VCoP) offer access to information and exchange possibilities for people in similar situations, which might be especially valuable for the self-management of chronic diseases.

There is scarce evidence on the clinical impact of these

Table 1. Characteristics of patients

| | Intervention group (n = 108) | Control group (n = 101) |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Age, M (SD) | 58.34 (8.68) | 59.47 (9.34) |
| Gender, n (%) | | · / |
| Women | 21 (19.4) | 15 (14.9) |
| Men | 84 (77.8) | 84 (83.2) |
| Autonomous Community, n (%) | | |
| Canary Islands | 24 (22.2) | 33 (32.7) |
| Catalonia | 51 (47.2) | 33 (32.7) |
| Madrid | 33 (30.6) | 35 (34.7) |
| Marital status, n (%) | | |
| Single | 10 (9.3) | 7 (6.9) |
| Married | 69 (63.9) | 65 (64.4) |
| With partner | 11 (10.2) | 7 (6.9) |
| Separated/divorced | 14 (13.0) | 10 (9.9) |
| Widow | 2 (1.9) | 3 (3) |
| Living alone, n (%) | 13 (12.0) | 10 (9.9) |
| Educational level, n (%) | 1 (0 0) | - / - > |
| Primary education not completed | T (0.9) | 5 (5) |
| Primary education | 21 (19.4) | 18 (17.8) |
| Secondary education | 37 (34.3) | 33 (32.7) |
| lertiary education | 46 (42.6) | 41 (40.6) |
| Clinical variables | Intervention group (n = 98) | (n = 87) |
| Obesity, n (%) | 19 (19.4) | 23 (26.4) |
| If obese, body mass index, M (SD) | 31.4 (1.5) | 32.9 (3.1) |
| Smoker, n (%) | 37 (37.8) | 32 (36.8) |
| Lipid profile | | |
| HDL-C, M (SD) | 43.5 (12.7) | 44.5 (25.0) |
| LDL-C, M (SD) | 95.7 (41.8) | 92.9 (37.3) |
| Number of angina episodes in the last week, M (SD) | 0.2 (0.8) | 0.3 (0.6) |
| Duration of the ischemic heart disease, in months, M (SD) | 9.1 (6.7) | 9.6 (8.3) |

interventions on people with chronic conditions.

METHOD

A pragmatic randomised controlled trial is being performed in Catalonia, Madrid and Canary Islands, Spain.

Three-hundred patients with a recent diagnosis of ischemic heart disease (IHD) attending GP practices and hospitals should be selected and randomised to the intervention or control group to reach an adequate sample size.

The intervention group is being offered participation for 12 months in a VCoP/based on a gamified web 2.0 platform with educational material, as well as interaction with other patients and a multidisciplinary professional team. Intervention and control groups are receiving usual care.

- **Primary outcome**: measured with the Patient Activation Measure (PAM) questionnaire at baseline, 6, 12 and 18 months.
- Secondary outcomes include: clinical variables; self-efficacy on managing the disease (Self-management of Chronic Disease Scale, SMCDS), quality of life (EuroQoL questionnaire, EQ-5D-5L), self-perceived general health (EQ-VAS), anxiety and depression (Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, HADS-A & HADS-D). Data is collected from self-reported questionnaires and electronic medical records.

RESULTS

- Two hundred and nine participants have been recruited so far. Intervention and control groups did not show significant differences at baseline in any variable (Tables 1 and 2).
- At the time of the analysis, 142 participants have completed 6 months since recruitment, showing a rate of missing values between 19.0%-20.4% depending on the questionnaire (Table 3).
- Among completers, the intervention did not show significant effects on any of the assessed measures (Table 3). A tendency towards significance was found for self-efficacy on managing the disease: the intervention group obtained a better result than the control group.

Table 2. Baseline scores of dependent variables

| | INTERVENTION | CONTROL | p* | |
|--|--------------|-------------|-------|--|
| PAM (0-100) (n=169) | 61.7 (15.9) | 62.8 (14.7) | 0.648 | |
| SMCDS (4-40) (n=172) | 26.4 (8.0) | 27.5 (7.7) | 0.359 | |
| EQ-5D-5L (0-1) (n=171) | 0.87 (0.14) | 0.86 (0.16) | 0.976 | |
| EQ-VAS (0-100) (n=172) | 75.7 (19.3) | 71.5 (23.5) | 0.198 | |
| HADS-A (4-28) (n=169) | 12.7 (3.7) | 13.1 (4.5) | 0.543 | |
| HADS-D (4-28) (n=170) | 10.6 (3.5) | 11.2 (4.3) | 0.324 | |
| *p-value from Student's t-test for independent samples | | | | |

Table 3. Effect of the intervention at 6-month follow-up in study completers

| N = 110-115 | CONTROL | INTERVENTION | B (p)* |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| PAM (0-100) | 60.5 (15.7) | 63.9 (15.5) | 3.8 (0.149) |
| SMCDS (4-40) | 27.3 (8.9) | 27.9 (8.3) | 1.9 (0.088) |
| EQ-5D-5L (0-1) | 0.86 (0.15) | 0.90 (0.13) | 0.0 (0.383) |
| EQ-VAS (0-100) | 73.6 (24.7) | 79.9 (16.3) | 5.2 (0.152) |
| HADS-A (7-28) | 12.7 (4.0) | 12.2 (3.9) | -0.4 (0.482) |
| HADS-D (7-28) | 10.9 (4.2) | 10.2 (3.6) | -0.4 (0.458) |

*Unstandardized coefficients (p-value) from linear regression models with group allocation as independent variable, adjusting for the baseline value of the dependent variable

CONCLUSIONS

POINTS FOR DISCUSSION



- Due to the COVID-19 situation, which is affecting primary and specialized care, recruitment is a major challenge. Participants will continue to be recruited continuously until the desired sample size is achieved in order to maintain the integrity and validity of the trial.
- The results of this study will provide evidence on the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of an alternative way of managing patients with a recent diagnosis of IHD by using a VCoP, which could be extended to other chronic patients/settings.
- How to optimize patient recruitment with the COVID-19 situation.
- Usefulness of VCoP for IHD and other chronic diseases: strengths and limitations.
- How to overcome the barriers and limitations that VCoP might pose for people with chronic diseases.



This study has been funded by Instituto de Salud Carlos III (ISCIII) through the project "PI18/01397" and co-funded by the European Union